

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements  
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

FRIDAY, MAY 3, 1918

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York. Telephone: 1000. Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Please send address changes to The Tribune, New York, N. Y.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York	
IN THE UNITED STATES: OUTSIDE OF GREATER NEW YORK	
Daily and Sunday	1 yr. 6 mo. 3 mo. 1 mo.
Daily only	\$12.00 \$6.00 \$3.00 \$1.50
Sunday only	1.00 .50 .25 .15
CANADIAN RATES	
Daily and Sunday	\$10.00 \$5.00 \$2.50 \$1.00
Daily only	8.00 4.00 2.00 1.00
Sunday only	1.00 .50 .25 .15
FOREIGN RATES	
Daily and Sunday	\$24.00 \$12.00 \$6.00 \$2.00
Daily only	20.00 10.00 5.00 2.00
Sunday only	2.00 1.00 .50 .15

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

**GUARANTEE**  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon return. No red tape. No waiting. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS**  
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein. All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

The "Times" Airplane "Conspiracy"

"The Times" of yesterday, taking its cue apparently from the prevailing disposition to lynch, without trial, any reputation that may be needed to explain our failure more quickly to get into the war, contains an article of such implications as seem to us to pass the bounds of fair-minded journalism.

In effect, it builds up a case that the delay in the production of aeroplanes was the result of "a conspiracy."

"An organized conspiracy, bold, powerful, numerous, made up of men able to formulate a definite plan, and embracing within their number men sufficiently high-placed and influential to have the ear and the confidence of the Secretary of War."

Brushing aside any thought that there may have been no such "failure" of the aeroplane programme as it pictures, "The Times" asks, "What was the motive of these conspirators?" and prints this insinuation:

"Was it their expectation that by misleading the Secretary and the people they could conceal their failure to produce aeroplanes for a time until they had pocketed the gains of their profiteering contracts?"

As this seems an insufficient motive for such a gigantic crime, "The Times" imagines a still more damning purpose. It says:

"If, however, it was the chief and actual purpose of these conspirators to delay production, to prevent the construction of aeroplanes, to deprive the government and the army of those eyes of the righting force upon the production of which so much depends, then all is explained. That is a theory under which all the facts arrange themselves in orderly and harmonious relation. If all the persons in charge of airplane production, with \$1,000,000,000 at their command and nearly a year's time to work in, had actually desired to produce aeroplanes, would they not have produced them? We need not inquire why anybody should wish to obstruct the execution of the airplane production programme. That question answers itself. It is answered by a thousand strange happenings in American industrial establishments during the last three years."

In plain words, "The Times" insinuation is that the United States government, in the War Department and in the Aircraft Board, was a vile conspiracy to delay and defeat the aircraft programme in the interest of Germany. In the length and breadth of the European war, in all its four years on either side, we doubt if any such charge as this has been made in any country. In plain terms this charge is that such men as General Squier, Mr. Howard A. Coffin, at the head of the Aircraft Board, and such other men as Colonel R. L. Montgomery, Colonel Deeds and all the rest were in effect German spies and German agents.

If "The Times" charges or insinuations had any basis of fact, it means that these men ought to be taken out and shot.

We hold no brief for any of the men whom "The Times" thus so wantonly accuses any more than we did for the gentlemen in charge of the work at Hog Island, when their reputations were put in jeopardy by the astonishing letter which the President wrote to the Attorney General. It is clear enough that General Squier was altogether unfitted for the work to which he was assigned; and it may well have been that in the dark days of last winter, when there seemed not a gleam of cheerfulness to be found anywhere in any government undertaking, the publicity end of the aircraft production indulged in statements or predictions that were absurdly optimistic and quite misleading. As to all that we have nothing to say.

But when "The Times" goes further and covertly charges that such men as Mr. Coffin, Colonel Montgomery and their like were party to a "conspiracy" to deceive the people and to delay airplane production, it simply goes beyond the bounds of sanity. There are no men in the whole nation who have given more freely of their time, their energy and their enthusiasm than these same men whom "The Times" would brand as "conspirators."

The whole of this imaginary "conspiracy" seems to be based upon the persistent and insistent efforts of the Aeronautical Society to discredit the airplane production work.

The Tribune cannot pretend to say that there were not grave errors of judgment and perhaps a serious lack of administrative decision in the aeroplane work thus far. But it has at least done what "The Times" does not seem to have felt worth doing even to the slenderest extent before this slanderous editorial was written. That was to order a painstaking investigation of the work, by Mr. Theodore M. Knappen, which has been duly printed in these columns. Writing from Detroit, as was printed in "The Tribune" of April 25, Mr. Knappen reported:

"Manufacturers assert, directly contrary to general opinion, that the Liberty motor record is one of the most creditable achievements in the history of American industry. They say that when the misunderstanding caused by hyperpolitical publicity and premature boasting has been cleared up it will be conceded on all sides that American engineering plants have contributed another bright page to the record of American manufacturing performance."

But this is not all. As to the alterations and changes in plans which have been held to be responsible for a large part of the aeroplane delay, and which "The Times" insinuates were purposeful and conspiratorial, Mr. Knappen says:

"As to alterations, the manufacturers assert that they were only what were to be expected. Moreover, they make the astounding statement that 95 per cent of the alterations originated with them instead of with the Signal Corps. They admit that the scrapping and waste incidental to alterations has been prodigious, but declare that it was the inevitable price of attaining quantity production with a new machine within a short time. Alterations are still being made, and, they say, it will always be so. They are productive of serious delays in the early stages of quantitative production, but afterward are to be taken as part of the routine of production."

We deeply hope that the "grand jury investigation" which "The Times" demands will be made, and its charges probed to the utmost. Then, if the facts are as we believe they are, we hope that our neighbor will make the *amende honorable* to the men against whom it has made such an infamous charge.

Addresses, Too

President Wilson has wisely reversed the War Department's policy of withholding the addresses of soldiers whose names are carried on the published casualty lists. The addresses are to be given hereafter. If they are not given the lists become too blind to be worth publishing.

The French government prints no casualty lists at all. Announcements are made to soldiers' relatives by letter. That method has its merits. If addresses are suppressed on the theory that they give military information to the enemy, the names ought to be suppressed also.

At this stage of the fighting and with complete German knowledge of the extent of our man power, little military disadvantage will be risked by the full publication of American casualties. There is a strong demand for complete information about this country's participation in the war. It is discreet to satisfy it. We are not afraid to disclose our losses or to let Germany puzzle out their implications, to whatever extent she will.

Fit for Anything

Another American, an automobile racer, Rickenbacher, has been added to the list of trained athletes who have distinguished themselves in the air. The list is a long one, but it is no whit longer than that of plain civilians, with no noteworthy record as athletes, who have developed into crack fliers. Guérin, the most promising of the newer French fliers, was a clerk in a Havre shop. So runs the story in every camp and cantonment.

The moral is fairly plain. Athletic prowess is a help, but it is not indispensable. What are absolutely necessary are the sound heart and lungs and nerves which come only from good, husky health, won and preserved by a reasonable attention to bodily needs. Such equipment does not necessarily belong to the crack athlete who has rowed his four-mile races or done his hippodrome stunts. The call that war issues is for sound, all-round physical development—not so much excessive muscular training as good, open-air exercise week by week.

Universal military training would go far to answer this call. So would an increasing sense of national obligation to be strong, to be fit, to be ready for a fight or a frolic. The lesson is one that we can all study and digest for use in the days ahead when we are planning the upbringing of future generations in a world that, however safe for democracy, will never be wholly safe for the defenders of democracy.

The End in the Ukraine

The German military authorities in Kiev have dispossessed the marionette government of the Ukrainian Republic. Thus has the altruistic principle of "self-determination," interpreted by German diplomats and generals, quickly borne its perfect fruit.

"Self-determination" was a generous and lofty sentiment when it was appealed to for the purpose of disintegrating the ancient empire of the Romanoffs. The subject races greedily embraced the Brest-Litovsk dogma. They saw in it the hope of an independence achieved without effort or cost. What they didn't see was that it was only sugar to draw them into the German fly trap.

Germany made the Ukraine independent. In doing so she annulled the old Russian mortgage, but she also plastered on the Ukrainians a mortgage of her own. She became the guarantor and administrator, then its master.

The Germans needed the Ukraine as a granary. They wanted wheat and cattle. They wanted agriculture resumed. Therefore they had to restore stability and order. It seemed to them that they could get better results out of a return to the old proprietary system, which the Ukraine revolutionaries had upset. So General von Eichorn, the military commander, directed a restitution of all

property of landlords seized when the Soviets began to run wild.

The phantom government of the republic not being willing to lend itself to an undoing of the work of the revolution, of which it was itself a product, its members were got rid of by thrusting them into prison. Germany's will is law in Ukraine, just as it is in Lithuania, Courland, Livonia, Estonia and Finland. These de-Russianized provinces have exchanged a King Log in Petrograd for a King Stork in Berlin.

Even in the Reichstag nowadays the "self-determination of peoples" has become a cynical jest. The exquisite comedy of the offer by Courland of a grand ducal crown to William II is appreciated even there. "No annexations" is dismissed now as a painful indiscretion of the past.

That is German psychology. Lenin and Trotzky didn't understand it. Neither did the innocent-minded Ukrainians. They are wiser to-day. Every country which becomes the beneficiary of Germany's friendship or patronage has already accepted its destiny as a vassal state.

Hail Anzacs!

The men from Australia, which is to say Gallipoli, have the hearts of New York and the warmest welcome we can give them. When Pershing's men and the "Blue Devils" of France and the Anzacs march up Broadway there is a scene and a tug at emotions which this old town has never known before. It is a small column of marching men as units go to-day. It is East and West, North and South, the Old and the New, the minute men of civilization the world around, marching as comrades to the rescue of all we hold dear.

No wonder the crowds along the sidewalks cheered as never before. We recognize in these rangy frontiersmen of Australia our own brothers. They are a long way from home. May their welcome here cheer their hearts and make them feel that we are indeed with them, heart and soul, proud of their deathless record, proud to stand with their khaki line in the fight for truth and righteousness!

5,000,000 the Minimum

Whether Congress continues to regulate the strength of the army and the size of the conscription quotas or decides to turn its Constitutional power to do these things over to Secretary Baker, one fact remains. In view of the military situation in France a very large increase in the military establishment has become imperative.

The present authorized strength of the army is about 2,600,000. The present actual strength is probably not above 1,600,000. This includes all the men in the cantonments here—some of them in the first stages of training.

There is a big difference between a total of men under arms and an actual fighting strength at the front. The military critics, when they talk of the armies fighting in France, take account only of divisions actually in use or held in readiness as reserves.

The German divisions on the front from the North Sea to Switzerland were reckoned, before the March offensive began, at something over 200. Allowing 12,000 men for a division (and that is a little above the German average), Hindenburg had at his disposal a total of from 2,400,000 to 2,500,000 men. But there are large second line forces garrisoning Belgium and employed in auxiliary work in the rear. The total German strength in the West—fighting men and auxiliaries—is probably over 3,500,000. It is estimated that of the American Expeditionary Army in France not more than 60 per cent consists of fighting men.

Our paper total of 2,600,000 is, therefore, much smaller than it looks. The selective draft law authorized an expansion of the Regular Army to a strength of over 400,000. It authorized the expansion of the former National Guard to a strength of between 400,000 and 600,000. It authorized the drafting of two national armies of 500,000 each, with sufficient replacement units. If the replacement force is put in each case at 300,000, the government may raise 1,600,000 men under the terms of the selective conscription law.

Provision was also made for the voluntary recruitment of four divisions (the Roosevelt volunteer army). But the Administration decided to make no use of this power.

Of the second draft army of 500,000 (800,000 with replacement units) only a small fraction has so far been called to the colors.

It is evident, therefore, that under existing authorizations an army of adequate fighting strength cannot be produced. If we want to have 2,000,000 fighting men abroad in 1919 we ought to increase our present paper total to 5,000,000. At the best, the men to be called in the third and fourth drafts will hardly be able to get to the front before the latter half of next year. They cannot get to the front at all unless the President asks Congress to give him power to go on with the conscription process.

If we go on (and we must go on) why waste time by aiming at an army of less than five millions?

Warning to Authors

(From The Boston Transcript)  
One of Mr. Kipling's trees was injured by a bus, the driver of which was also landlord of an inn. Kipling wrote this man a letter of complaint, which the recipient sold to one of his guests for ten shillings. Again the angry author wrote, this time a more violent letter, which immediately fetched \$1.

A few days later Kipling called on the landlord and demanded to know why he had refused to answer to his letters.

"Why, I was hoping you would send me a fresh one every day," was the cool reply; "they pay a great deal better than bus driving."

Coiled in the Flag  
HEARS-S-S-T

AS IT is unique among crawling things we do not know yet entirely what kind of animal it is. We shall not know until it is wholly uncloaked and disentwined from the refuge it desecrates.

The Tribune is attacking it at the head. We have not been attending to its tail. But it has offensive resources at that end also, as we might have known.

Its reply to our uncovering its head as the most disloyal object in the country has been to make a frightened stink in the news columns of "The New York American," which on Sunday last, April 28, printed the following:

"Tribune's" Dishonesty Exposed by Chief Editor

"Frank H. Simonds, editor-in-chief of The New York Tribune, resigned his post as chief of staff of that paper because he found it impossible to prevent the publication in that paper of fraudulent foreign news dispatches of attacks on American soldiers, picturing disgraceful doings of a few of our soldiers abroad, and because the management of The Tribune insisted upon publishing editorials dictated by the business office in the interest of private corporations against the protest of the chief editor."

"The Tribune, having a contract with Mr. Simonds for his personal services, refused to accept his resignation and endeavored to induce Mr. Simonds to continue to write war articles for The Tribune."

"As Mr. Simonds had been engaged as chief editor, he felt that his honor and dignity forbade his working in any capacity for a paper whose policy he had found both dishonest and hurtful to American interests in the war."

"The Tribune has now sought an injunction from Vice-Chancellor Backes, of Newark, N. J., to prevent Mr. Simonds from quitting its service."

"Mr. Simonds has declined for more than a month now to write for The Tribune or to have anything to do with it because of its 'false and dangerous articles and its publication of foreign dispatches that had no foreign origin.'"

"The words are those of his counsel, Lemuel E. Quigg, who added in court that the editorial page of The Tribune was 'subject to suspicion.'"

"The Vice-Chancellor yesterday granted a temporary injunction."

We should not bother about it on our own account, but The Tribune believes that its readers, in return for their abiding confidence in us, are entitled to know more about the facts of our household dispute with Mr. Simonds than we have hitherto thought it needful to publish. We shall disclose nothing that is not already on the public record in the Chancery Court of New Jersey. We shall limit ourselves to the opinion and findings of the Hon. John H. Backes, Vice-Chancellor, who on Saturday last, April 27, granted an injunction to restrain Mr. Simonds from violating his contract with The Tribune.

The court began by defining Mr. Simonds's status, thus:

"The defendant, Frank H. Simonds, entered into a written contract with the complainant, The Tribune Association, in January of 1915, to serve it for a period of four years as an editorial writer, and as such to have charge of the editorial page of The New York Tribune, and authority over the hours of labor and terms of employment of other editorial writers, subject only to the direction of the editor-in-chief and the assistant editor of the paper. As a part of his undertaking, Mr. Simonds covenanted that he 'will not write for or contribute to any other publication or periodical during the term of this agreement, except that he shall have the right to contribute to monthly magazines or to weekly magazines, which are not to be published in connection with or as part of any newspaper.'"

It will be seen from this that Mr. Simonds was never editor-in-chief of The Tribune, as "The New York American" says; but an editor subject to the editor in chief and the assistant editor. Therefore, he was third in rank of authority.

The court then proceeded to discuss the causes that "led to the break," and said:

"Mr. Simonds was with The Tribune for three years, and as we read his complaint, there were two specific matters, and two only, that caused him to abandon his employer, and upon which he rests his refusal to further live up to his contract. Without particularizing in his answering affidavit, he speaks of disagreements from time to time, but he specifically adverts to but two matters. One was a difference of views as to the treatment, editorially, of last winter's coal situation, in connection with the shutting down of breweries and moving-picture houses; and the other was over the preferential placement of an editorial upon the Colgate Soap litigation to that of an editorial tribute to the late Congressman Gardner. These two brought on the acute situation that led to Mr. Simonds's resignation, so far as his affidavit disclosed details. But we are supplied with particulars of other instances, which perhaps Mr. Simonds had in mind as having caused friction, by the testimony of Mr. Rogers, the vice-president of the Association and one of its managers. Mr. Rogers speaks of an occasion early in the war when Mr. Simonds thought it wise policy that The Tribune advocate an embargo upon shipments to the Allies. There was some discussion and disagreement of views, but the matter was settled amicably. There were other differences. Mr. Simonds questioned the advisability of publishing reports concerning the conduct of our soldiers abroad, and criticised the publication of a Milan dispatch relating to war conditions, which may have been unfounded in fact, and there may have been some more, but they were all of matters upon which honest minds differed and which reasonable men adjust. In the course of the argument, counsel said that Mr. Simonds was constantly irritated. That Mr. Garrett, one of the associate editors, constantly, so to speak, stuck pins into Mr. Simonds, but it seems to me that another metaphor would have been more appropriate—that Mr. Simonds was the magnet that drew the pins toward him. There is not a scintilla of evidence in the case that warranted the statement; on the contrary, the truth is that the entire managerial and editorial staff, including Mr. Ogden Reid, the editor in chief, and, as I understand, proprietor, or member of the family that owns the paper, treated him with the utmost courtesy and consideration. They deferred to him, they humored him, and, as aptly said by counsel, they 'nursed him.' There is nothing in the affidavits disclosing that at any time his judgment did not prevail, when he asserted himself, subject to the direction of the editor in chief and the assistant editor. There were, of course, disagreements between Mr. Simonds and some of the other members of the large staff of this influential newspaper, but they all arose from an honest expression of views, which, it would seem, Mr. Simonds could not always tolerate without irritation. Mr. Simonds is highly temperamental—an attribute of genius—and much, if not all, of the trouble arose from his temperamental indulgences. But this condition furnishes no valid excuse for his rash act, for, when The Tribune engaged him, it hired him for his editorial qualities minus his temperamental tendencies, which he should have repressed."

It may be proper to explain that the Milan dispatch was a translation from an important Italian paper, printed as mail correspondence under a Rome date line. The date line was wrong, the head was misleading and in the translation an equivocal word was used, but the sense of the article could not have been misunderstood by any one who read it through. It was an exhortation to the Italians not to be misled by pro-German propaganda.

As to the immediate cause of Mr. Simonds's resignation, namely, the transposition of two editorials, the court said:

"His grievance was purely fancied and his resignation was unjust."

In another place the court said:

"No sensible man would say that these trivial circumstances as they have been disclosed by the affidavits justified Mr. Simonds severing his connection."

Therefore the court found that Mr. Simonds broke his contract with The Tribune and had no right to make the contract he did make

WHAT DOES THE GENERAL STAFF HAVE TO REPORT?



—From The Indianapolis News

several weeks later to write military articles for the McClure Syndicate.

The court's decision was:

"I will grant an injunction in the language of the covenant, that the said Frank H. Simonds be and he is hereby restrained from writing for or contributing to any other publication other than The New York Tribune," etc.

It gives us great pleasure to be able to add that in making his contract with the McClure Syndicate Mr. Simonds stipulated that none of his articles should ever be sold to a Hearst newspaper.

You cannot touch a thing like William Randolph Hearst without getting some of it on your hands.

The Poisoned Tongue

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Permit me to add a few observations to your editorial comment on the letter of Mr. Walter Jaeger in to-day's issue of The Tribune on the subject, "The Poisoned Tongue."

Mr. Jaeger first sets up a hypothetical question "we frequently hear": "Would Germany permit the enemy language in her schools, or allow newspapers in the enemy language on her newstands?" and then sets out to answer it. He recites several instances of French schools maintained in Germany, but, at best, their number is very limited, even by the use of a vague plural. He might have truly added that French is taught in a majority of Germany's higher educational institutions, even though as an optional course or study. But such a contention begs the question. No one ever doubted Germany's preparatory courses for the advent of "The Day." No one has ever pretended that the German language as such is inherently an evil, no more than any other language. The correct question might be: "Would Germany permit within her borders the publication of newspapers or literature of any sort, in the language of an enemy with whom she is at war, by enemy aliens, or naturalized aliens, former subjects of that enemy, whose loyalty is under suspicion?"

I do not doubt for a moment that Mr. Jaeger would boldly answer, "Yes," for he also says in his letter: "There has never been any thought of suppressing the French schools, neither during 1786-1814, when Prussia was under the heel of Napoleon, nor 1870-71."

What occult powers enable Mr. Jaeger to disclose "the thoughts" of the Prussian government on the French language in 1786-1814 I am not prepared to say. Let the readers judge.

As to 1870-71, I believe I am better qualified to express an opinion than Mr. Jaeger.

I was born in Strassburg, the capital of Alsace, under the French régime, and passed through the siege and bombardment of that city by the Germans, and through all that followed. What, then, are the facts?

The teaching of the French language was immediately prohibited as soon as the German army set foot in the city. There was a banker, a Mr. Stehlin, who at his own expense opened a private school for Alsatian children, where French was taught. It was promptly and ruthlessly "squashed." What happened to Mr. Stehlin no one has ever been able to find out. All publications in French, whether newspapers, trade journals, literary periodicals, whatever their name and purpose, were suppressed. All societies and organizations, syndicates, literary, musical, social, or of arts and trades, of whatever name or character, however innocuous, were dissolved. Thus operated "the heel" of Prussianism in Alsace in 1870, and for decades thereafter; for does Mr. Jaeger know, or remember, that the "state of siege," martial law, under which Alsace-Lorraine has been governed by Prussia, was only partially and conditionally lifted but few years ago? Will Mr. Jaeger enlighten us as to the publications in the French language in Alsace-Lorraine by Frenchmen or pro-French Alsatians under the German régime since 1870 to this day?

Mr. Jaeger cites "La Gazette des Ardennes," published in French by the Prussian invaders in Belgium. This is a direct slap in the face of decency, humanity and civilization. It sufficiently characterizes Mr. Jaeger's lack of sincerity in his letter to The Tribune. As to his "loyalty": his malicious innuendo on the attitude of the French-Canadians in the present war, his notoriously untrue assertion of "the many attempts of their English-language neighbors to interfere with their language and their customs"; and the final wave of the Star-Spangled Banner: "The Americans of German descent will, of course, do everything to help win the war, no matter what happens, . . . their publications . . . have done everything in their power to further the great cause to which the nation has dedicated itself," entitled Mr. Jaeger to a berth in the folds of one of Mr. Hearst's papers.

EMILE KREIS.

New York, April 28, 1918.

Swivel Chair Patriotism

(From The Boston Transcript)  
"What job would you prefer if you went into the army?"  
"Oh, General work."

With the Enemy

The New York Tribune Foreign Press Bureau

LUDENDORFF passed his fifty-third birthday recently, and the German newspapers broke out in eulogy like a malignant rash. The "Vöser Zeitung" compared him to Julius Caesar, pointing out where Ludendorff was superior to the well known writer and thinker, and continued:

"Ludendorff is the man who threw down Russia, Rumania and Italy and is now confronted with the gigantic task of breaking England, France and America at one blow. This blow is still to be struck, but signs are at hand that it will succeed."

"He not only worked for Germany's victory over her foreign enemies, but also against her inner enemy, who threatened him in his work. Ludendorff's devotion to Hindenburg caused him to work always in silence, even when political parties tried to ruin his credit."

"He is the man who always understood that, against the enemy in the West only a 'sword peace' is possible. Hindenburg is the man who freed us from our old perils, and we love him, but Ludendorff is the leader of the new Young Germany, which recognizes action only, and we admire him."

New reasons for German aggression crop up every day in the German mind. Professor Roth, of Greifswald, has discovered why the Franco-German frontier should be "pushed a few miles into France." He says: "After the wooden peace with Finland and the bread peace with Ukraine, we are now going to have an oil peace with Rumania. We have been obliged to cut off the claws of the Rumanian beasts of prey by removing the frontier line between Rumania and Hungary further to the east. On the French boundary in the west we must live in peace."

"We must alter the frontier line along the Vosges. On the German side of the Vosges the mountains are steeped, whereas on the French side they rise in a gentle incline. Shall the French have all the strategic advantage and we all the disadvantage?"

Heinrich Friedjung, the Austrian official thanks to whose endeavors a few years ago many Austrian Serbs and Croats had been innocently sentenced and executed, in a letter written from Vienna to the "Vöser Zeitung," declares that Austria failed to get her share of the booty recently captured on the Russian front because the opponents of the Austro-German alliance prevented the Germans immediately after the negotiations with Russia had been broken off. Friedjung says that the Austrian Socialists, Czechs and Poles tried to persuade the government not to take part in the new invasion of Russia, and while the Austrian government was hesitating the German armies captured 8,000 cars and large quantities of provisions. The author of the letter finds great satisfaction in the idea that Austria has been justly punished by losing her share of the booty for her attempt to desert Germany.

He then goes on to point out that the movement to separate Austria-Hungary from Germany is gaining more and more force in Austria. Its main champions are the Czechs and the Poles. He claims to have seen the text of a recent memorandum sent by the Czech leader, Lamarch, former president of The Hague Tribunal, to Emperor Charles of Austria, with the request that he should break off her alliance with Germany and that this intention should be immediately communicated to the Allies and to Germany. He also points out that the Poles in the Austrian Reichsrat have made similar requests from the Austrian government.

Russia

MORE terrible and wonderful than the apparitions of the Apocalypse.  
Is the evocation of the Russian soul. Half Christian, half Nietzschean, Don Quixote with a crown of thorns, Satan with the imitation in his sack.

Bleeding Titan from the debris and dust of a downfallen planet. This shaggy Hamlet and unkempt Israel Throws again his mighty shadow over The rotten rookeries of civilization.  
BENJAMIN DE CAMERON.